



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/757,792 | 01/15/2004 | Brian J. Cragun | ROC920030266US1 | 5430 |

46797 7590 03/09/2007

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
 DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
 ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

DEBROW, JAMES J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|--|------------|---------------|
| 2 MONTHS | 03/09/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAR 09 2007

Technology Center 2100

Application Number: 10/757,792
Filing Date: January 15, 2004
Appellant(s): CRAGUN ET AL.

Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876

For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 22 Sep. 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 22 Jun. 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 2176

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

| | | |
|-------------|-----------|--------|
| 6728760 | Fairchild | 5-1999 |
| 20030196164 | Gupta | 9-1999 |

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the

Art Unit: 2176

subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1, 4, 7-13, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fairchild et al. (Patent No.: 6,728,760 B1; Filing Date: May. 5, 1999) (hereinafter 'Fairchild') in view of Gupta et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0196164 A1; Filed Sep. 15, 1999) (hereinafter 'Gupta').**

In regard to independent claim 1, Fairchild discloses a *method for managing annotations comprising:*

detecting one or more changes to a document having at least one annotation corresponding to at least one portion of the document prior to occurrence of the one or more changes (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.);

if so, updating an annotation record based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to documents.).

Fairchild does not disclose expressly, *determining if the at least one annotation should be applied to the document as changed, based on whether one of a set of one or*

Art Unit: 2176

more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected.

However, Gupta teaches *determining if the at least one annotation should be applied to the document, as changed, based on whether one of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected* (0095-0096; 0104; 306 in Fig. 9; Gupta teaches an annotation server determines which version of multimedia content the annotation corresponds to. The annotation server receives an indication of the target stream for the annotation. The target stream is a particular version of multimedia content to which the annotation corresponds, and may be an individual media stream or a composite media stream. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that the annotation server application in combination with the target stream, and/or composite media stream could consist of *policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected*).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *different versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 4, Fairchild discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document comprises:*

copying an existing annotation record referring to the document prior to the one or more changes (column 7, lines 33-35; Fairchild teaches annotations can be copied from one media base to another. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching transferring the annotations of one document to an updated version of that document); *and*

updating the annotation record copied to reflect the one or more changes to the document (column 5, lines 1-5).

In regard to dependent claim 7, Fairchild discloses *the method of claim 1, further comprising, prior to updating the annotation record:*

notifying a user the document has changed (column 1, lines 41-43; column 2, lines 47-52); *and*

receiving validation from the user that the annotation should be applied to the document as changed (column 9, lines 9-13; Fig. 7; Fairchild discloses an user interface Edit Annotation form. Clicking the "Edit Annotation" button validates the user acceptance of updating and annotation record.).

In regard to independent claim 8, Fairchild discloses *a method comprising: receiving a document to be checked into a content management system, the*

Art Unit: 2176

document having at least one annotation corresponding to an annotated portion thereof, wherein one or more changes to the document have been made subsequent to creation of the annotation (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.);

updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to one or more changes in documents.).

Fairchild does not disclose expressly, *determining if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed, by determining whether a creator of the annotation specified the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document.*

However, Gupta teaches *determining if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed, by determining whether a creator of the annotation specified the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document* (0082-0086; Fig. 8; Gupta teaches an interface in which the user can select annotations and various UI preferences for the annotations. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that at least one of the UI preference could be an option for the

creator of the annotation to specify whether the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *subsequent versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 9, Fairchild does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 8, wherein determining if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed comprises determining whether a creator of the annotation specified the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document by selecting a policy from a set of policies that determine how annotations should be applied to subsequent versions of the document.*

However, Gupta teaches *the method of claim 8, wherein determining if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed comprises determining whether a creator of the annotation specified the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document by selecting a policy from a set of policies that determine how annotations should be applied to subsequent versions of the document* (0095-0096; 0104; 306 in Fig. 9; Gupta teaches an annotation server determines which version of multimedia content the annotation corresponds to. The annotation server

Art Unit: 2176

receives an indication of the target stream for the annotation. The target stream is a particular version of multimedia content to which the annotation corresponds, and may be an individual media stream or a composite media stream. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that the annotation server application in combination with the target stream, and/or composite media stream could consist of *policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected*. 0082-0086; Fig. 8; Gupta further teaches an interface in which the user can select annotations and various UI preferences for the annotations. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that at least one of the UI preferences could be an option for the *creator of the annotation to specify whether the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document*.).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *different versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 10, Fairchild discloses *the method of claim 9*, further comprising:

determining if the user selected a policy that specifies that validation should occur prior to updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to

reflect the one or more changes to the document (column 9, lines 9-13; Fig. 7; Fairchild discloses an user interface Edit Annotation form. Clicking the "Edit Annotation" button validates the user acceptance of updating and annotation record.);

prompting a user for such validation (column 9, lines 9-13; Fig. 7; Fairchild discloses an user interface Edit Annotation form. Clicking the "Edit Annotation" button, validates the user acceptance of updating and annotation record.); *and*
updating the annotation record only after receiving such validation (column 5, line 1-5).

Fairchild does not disclose expressly *determining if the user selected a policy that specifies that validation should occur prior to updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document.*

However, Gupta teaches *determining if the user selected a policy that specifies that validation should occur prior to updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document* (0095-0096; 0104; 306 in Fig. 9; Gupta teaches an annotation server determines which version of multimedia content the annotation corresponds to. The annotation server receives an indication of the target stream for the annotation. The target stream is a particular version of multimedia content to which the annotation corresponds, and may be an individual media stream or a composite media stream. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that the annotation server application in combination with the target stream, and/or composite media stream could consist of a

policy that specifies that validation should occur prior to updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document. 0090; Gupta further teaches a dialog box that consist of a drop down-menu, which allow the user to select a name set to which the annotation belong. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that this drop down-menu could allow the user to select a policy or an option which selects a policy that specifies validation of the annotation record).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *different versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 11, Fairchild discloses *the method of claim 8, wherein updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document comprises:*

running an algorithm to identify the annotated portion of the document corresponding to the at least one annotation in the document as changed (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that an algorithm is no more than computer software to perform the tasked as claimed.); *and*

if the annotated portion is identified by the algorithm, updating the annotation record based on results of running the algorithm (column 5, line 1-5; At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that an algorithm is no more than computer software to perform the task as claimed.).

In regard to dependent claim 12, Fairchild discloses *the method of claim 11, further comprising, if the annotated portion is not identified by the algorithm:*

prompting a user to identify the annotation portion in the document, as changed (column 9, line 25-28); and

updating the annotation record based on input received from the user (column 9, line 28-31).

In regard to independent claim 13, Fairchild discloses *detecting one or more changes to a document having at least one annotation corresponding to at least one portion of the document prior to the one or more change (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.);*

updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to documents.).

Fairchild does not disclose expressly *a computer-readable medium containing a program which, when executed by a processor, performs operations comprising::*

determining if an annotation corresponding to at least one annotated portion of the document prior to the change should be applied to the document, as changed, based on whether one or more of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected.

However, Gupta teaches *a computer-readable medium containing a program which, when executed by a processor, performs operations comprising (0036):*

determining if an annotation corresponding to at least one annotated portion of the document prior to the change should be applied to the document, as changed, based on whether one or more of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected (0095-0096; 0104; 306 in Fig. 9; Gupta teaches an annotation server

determines which version of multimedia content the annotation corresponds to. The annotation server receives an indication of the target stream for the annotation. The target stream is a particular version of multimedia content to which the annotation corresponds, and may be an individual media stream or a composite media stream.

Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that the annotation server application in combination with the target stream, and/or composite

media stream could consist of *policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected*).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *different versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 16, Fairchild discloses *updating an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document comprising:*

copying an existing annotation record referring to the document prior to the one or more changes (column 7, lines 33-35; Fairchild teaches annotations can be copied from one media base to another. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching transferring the annotations of one document to an updated version of that document); *and*

updating the annotation record copied to reflect the one or more changes to the document (column 5, lines 1-5).

Fairchild does not disclose expressly *the computer-readable medium of claim 13*.

However, Gupta discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 13* (0036).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gupta with Fairchild for the benefit a computer-

Art Unit: 2176

readable medium embodied with instructions, when executed by a computer system would enable to computer system to update an annotation record associated with a document.

In regard to independent claim 17, Fairchild *discloses a system comprising:*
at least one application (column 2, lines 15-20);
an annotation maintenance component configured to detect changes to a document managed by the content management system, the document having at least one annotation corresponding to an annotated portion thereof, wherein one or more changes to the document have been made subsequent to creation of the annotation (column 8, line 65-67 & column 9, lines 1-2; Fairchild discloses automatic tracking of new versions of a document.).

update an annotation record containing the at least one annotation based on the one or more changes to the document (column 5, line 1-5; Fairchild discloses updating annotation records according to changes in media items (documents). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching to documents.).

Fairchild does not disclose expressly *a content management system for managing a plurality of documents manipulated by the at least one application;*
an annotation database for holding annotation records, each containing annotation data related to one or more of the plurality of documents; and

determine if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed based on whether one or more of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected.

However, Gupta teaches a content management system for managing a plurality of documents manipulated by the at least one application (0045-0051).

an annotation database for holding annotation records, each containing annotation data related to one or more of the plurality of documents (0011; Gupta teaches an annotation server for holding annotations that corresponds to the multimedia content. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply Gupta's teaching to documents.).

determine if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed based on whether one or more of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected (0095-0096; 0104; 306 in Fig. 9; Gupta teaches an annotation server determines which version of multimedia content the annotation corresponds to. The annotation server receives an indication of the target stream for the annotation. The target stream is a particular version of multimedia content to which the annotation corresponds, and may be an individual media stream or a composite media stream. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that the annotation server application in combination with the target stream, and/or composite media stream could

Art Unit: 2176

consist of *policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected*).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild with Gupta for the benefit of providing an improved way to create and maintain annotations corresponding to *different versions of the same document* (0010).

In regard to dependent claim 18, Fairchild discloses *the system of claim 17, wherein the annotation maintenance component is configured to update an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document by updating an annotation index stored in the annotation record* (column 5, lines 1-5).

In regard to dependent claim 19, Fairchild discloses *the system of claim 17, wherein the annotation maintenance component is configured to update an annotation record containing the at least one annotation to reflect the one or more changes to the document by updating a change detection value stored in the annotation record* (column 5, lines 1-5; column 8, lines 35-40).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Fairchild discloses *the system of claim 17, wherein the annotation maintenance component is integrated with the content management system* (column 5, lines 1-5; Fairchild discloses updating and deleting

Art Unit: 2176

media/document items (*content management*), and updating annotation records (*annotation maintenance*)).

3. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fairchild and Gupta in view of Sidana (Patent No.: 6,571,295 B1; Filing Date: Jul. 19, 1999).

In regard to dependent claim 2, Fairchild in view Gupta does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.*

However, Sidana discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document* (column 2, lines 31-33; Sidana discloses once the document is displayed in the browser, the user can modify (*update*) the annotations or other information associated with the document. The examiner uses the broadest interpretation "other information associated with the document" to include indexes indicating an annotated portion of the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild in view Gupta for the benefit of updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.

In regard to dependent claim 3, Fairchild in view Gupta does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating one or more indexes to refer to multiple versions of the document.*

However, Sidana discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating one or more indexes to refer to multiple versions of the document* (column 2, lines 31-33; Sidana discloses once the document is displayed in the browser, the user can modify (*update*) the annotations or other information associated with the document. The examiner uses the broadest interpretation "other information associated with the document" to include indexes indicating an annotated portion of the document. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the indexing to refer to multiple versions of a document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild in view Gupta for the benefit of updating to multiple versions of the document.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Fairchild in view Gupta does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 1, wherein detecting one or more changes to the document comprises comparing change detection values generated for the at least one annotated portion of the document prior to and after the one or more changes.*

However, Sidana discloses *the method of claim 1, wherein detecting one or more changes to the document comprises comparing change detection values generated for the at least one annotated portion of the document prior to and after the one or more changes* (column 10, lines 36-45; Sidana discloses a expired flag (*detection value*), which indicated a change has occurred in the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild in view Gupta with Sidana for the benefit of detecting one or more changes to the document.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Fairchild discloses *the method of claim 5, wherein the change detection values are hash values generated for the at least one annotated portion of the document prior to and after the one or more changes.* (column 8, lines 35-40; Fairchild discloses original media item (document) maintains as part of its annotation record, a list of locations (*hash values*) of copies of the media item (*document*). Using this list (hash table), it is possible to find that a cached copy of the media item (*document*) resides in a receiving cache on a server. As with the current invention, Fairchild teaches the concept of a hash table. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that hash tables would contain hash values.).

In regard to dependent claim 14, Fairchild in view Gupta does not disclose expressly *the computer-readable medium of claim 13, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.*

However, Sidana discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 13* (column 14, lines 1-2), *wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.*

Art Unit: 2176

(column 2, lines 31-33; Sidana discloses once the document is displayed in the browser, the user can modify (*update*) the annotations or other information associated with the document. The examiner uses the broadest interpretation "other information associated with the document" to include indexes indicating an annotated portion of the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sidana with Fairchild in view Gupta for the benefit of updating an index indicating an annotated portion of the document.

In regard to dependent claim 15, Fairchild in view Gupta does not disclose expressly *the computer-readable medium of claim 13, wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating generating a change detection value for the document, or a portion of the document, to reflect the one or more changes.*

However, Sidana discloses *the computer-readable medium of claim 13* (column 14, lines 1-2), *wherein updating the annotation record comprises updating generating a change detection value for the document, or a portion of the document, to reflect the one or more changes* (column 10, lines 36-45; Sidana discloses a expired flag (*detection value*), which indicated a change has occurred in the document).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Fairchild in view Gupta with Sidana for the benefit of detecting one or more changes to the document.

Note

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

(10) Response to Argument

1. Obviousness of Claims 1, 4, 7-13, and 16-20 over Fairchild in view of Gupta:

The Appellant argues *the Gupta reference is directed to associating annotations with multiple media streams of the same multimedia content. (Column 2, Lines: 50-51.) In Gupta a multimedia file (e.g., audio or video) may be stored in multiple versions or media streams, wherein the media streams have the same multimedia content yet vary in terms of resolution quality or bandwidth requirements. (Column 2, Lines: 14-22.). The multimedia content may have various streams such that a user may select one to download one according to his/her access bandwidth. Id. In Gupta an annotation for one of the media streams of the same multimedia content is applied to all of the media streams containing the same multimedia content. (Column 2, Lines: 53-59.)*

First and foremost, the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants' synopsis of the Gupta reference. Gupta discloses the multimedia presentations available to a user may include different versions of the same *underlying* multimedia content (0007). Gupta continues with describing differences in which multimedia presentations may differ, i.e. different resolutions, different bandwidth requirements, different presentation lengths, etc. (0007). It has been established and is obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that new/updated version of multimedia, documents, or the like, typically have the same underlying content. Therefore, the Examiner concludes Gupta is not directed to associating annotations with multiple media streams of the "same" multimedia content, wherein the media streams have the same multimedia content yet vary in terms of resolution quality or bandwidth requirements. However, Gupta is directed to associating annotations to multiple media streams with different versions of the same underlying multimedia content (0027).

The Appellant argues Gupta *fails to teach "determining if the at least one annotation should be applied to the document, as changed, based on whether one of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected" as recited in claims 1, 13, and 17. Furthermore, Appellant submit that Gupta fails to teach the claim 8 limitation of "determining if the annotation should be applied to the document as changed, by determining whether a creator of the annotation specified the annotations should be applied to subsequent versions of the document."*

The Examiner disagrees.

Gupta teaches an annotation entry is maintained by an annotation server in an annotation metadata store. The annotation entry includes a time range field which contains data representing "begin" and "end" times defining a media timeline to which annotation entry is associated. The begin and end times reference the version of the media content being played back when annotation was created, or alternatively reference the base version (0058-0062; Fig. 5). Gupta also teaches each annotation corresponding to multimedia content corresponds to each of the different versions of that content (0070). As with the current invention (Specification pg 15, 0051), Gupta teaches a graphical user interface in which the user can select or change the target stream of the annotation, such as by typing in a new identifier in the target area of the "add new annotation" dialog box (0086-0090; Fig. 7; Fig 8). Thus, Gupta teaches "determining if the at least one annotation should be applied to the document, as changed, based on whether one of a set of one or more policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document has been selected".

Second Argument:

Appellant argues Gupta annotations are always applied when equivalent media streams are found which contain the same multimedia content as the media stream

Art Unit: 2176

being annotated with no regards to any type of policies (Page 8, paragraphs [0104]-[0105].) Thus, Gupta does not disclose a set of policies determining how annotations should be applied to different versions of the same document.

The Examiner disagrees.

Gupta teaches an interface in which the user can select annotations and various UI preferences for the annotations. Using the broadest interpretation of Gupta's teaching, the Examiner concludes that at least one or combination of the UI preference could be interpreted as an option for the creator of the annotation to specify whether the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document (0082-0086; Fig. 8).

Note

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

In regards to Examiner response to Appellants argument presented in the Advisory Action, the Examiner does not concede that Gupta does not teach applying

Art Unit: 2176

annotations to documents as changed. The Examiner was merely stating that Gupta teachings of annotating different versions of multimedia can be applied to annotating newly created and updated/changed versions various multimedia/documents.

2. **Obviousness of Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 14, and 15 over Fairchild In view of Gupta and in further view of Sidana:**

The Appellant argues that Fairchild and Gupta fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the Independent claims upon which these dependent claims depend. Furthermore, applicants submit that Sidana also fails to overcome the deficiencies of Fairchild and Gupta with respect the independent claims described above.

The Examiner disagrees, and therefore maintains rejection and argument as stated above.

The Examiner address Appellant's argument as indicated in the above "grounds of Rejection" section.


(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART INTI 2176




Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100

Conferees:


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

Heather Herndon



Stephen Hong
STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER